

## **REMARKS**

The above-identified patent application has been reviewed in light of the Examiner's final Action dated June 24, 2009. In light of the amendments and arguments presented herein, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance.

Claims 12-21 have been objected to as being of improper independent form. Claim 1 has been objected to as failing to provide antecedent basis for "said processing stations are capable of starting independently". Claim 1 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 01/12440 to Lachowyn (Lachowyn) in view of DE 37299 to Braun et al., ("Braun").

Claims 1 and 12 have been amended. Claims 2-11 and 22-35 were previously withdrawn or cancelled. Accordingly, Claims 1 and 12-21 are now under consideration.

### **Objection to the Claims**

The Examiner has objected to Claims 12-21 as being of improper dependent form. Accordingly, Claim 12 has been amended to now depend on Claim 1. Therefore, Applicants request withdrawal of this objection to Claims 12-21.

Claim 1 has been objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for "said processing stations are capable of starting independently". Claim 1 has been amended to now read "said at least one processing station is capable of starting independently", thereby addressing this objection.

### **Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

The Examiner has rejected Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Lachowyn in view of Braun. In order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the prior art references must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection as Lachowyn fails to disclose a clock pulse for synchronizing the processing stations. Conversely, Lachowyn discloses a two-way relationship with multiple signal wherein "the sensor 64 senses, for example, an index reference on the article 20 or mandrel 16 at the position 24. The sensed signal is provided to the controller 26 ..." During the first step the sensors collect signals that are subsequently sent to the controller. Only after such collecting step does the controller generate multiple signals

to be sent to each of the servo motors. That is, “the controller provides control signals to each servo motor 52 to maintain registration for the blanket 46 at each print position with the article 20 being printed.” Contrary to aforesaid description of Lachowyn, an apparatus according to independent Claim 1 of the instant application is clearly more simple and, therefore, less error-prone.

The Examiner should also note that a further difference between the present invention and Lachowyn is the direct relationship to the processing stations. The transmission of the clock pulse is used directly for the processing step at the processing stations. In other words it could be said that a direct control is carried out. Contrary to such inventive concept, Lachowyn discloses an indirect control. In Lachowyn as well as in the Final Office Action it is stated that multiple signals are used which have to be sent to the processing stations and have to be interpreted at such processing stations as to a start and stop as well as the duration of the processing at each processing station. Beside the fact that such multiplicity of signals and the higher complexity of such signals increases the error-prone of such a system, the interpretation of received signals at the processing stations is an additional effort which usually results in an extended processing time.

Accordingly, Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly expresses that the starting signals do not provide for an indirect control as in Lachowyn. Claims 2-21 are also believed allowable due to their dependence on allowable Claim 1.

### **Conclusion**

Based on the foregoing, Applicants believe that all pending claims are in condition for allowance and such disposition is respectfully requested. Applicants also respectfully traverse the remainder of the Examiner’s assertions as to what is disclosed in and/or taught by the cited prior art. That is, since the arguments made herein are believed to sufficiently address the rejections, any assertions by the Examiner which are not specifically addressed are not admitted as true. Furthermore, any arguments concerning motivation to combine, rationale to combine, etc. and not specifically provided in this response are not waived.

In the event that a telephone conversation would further prosecution and/or expedite allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the Examiner’s earliest convenience.

Respectfully submitted,  
SHERIDAN ROSS P.C.

By: /C.W. Mueller/  
Craig W. Mueller  
Reg. No. 52,055  
1560 Broadway, Suite 1200  
Denver, Colorado 80202  
Telephone: 303-863-9700

Date: September 24, 2009